

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| <i>Interview Summary</i> | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/083,445 | PRAISNER ET AL. |
| | Examiner Jennifer Liversedge | Art Unit 3692 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jennifer Liversedge.

(3) Steve Philips.

(2) Jay Kramer.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 01 August 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent 6,226,624 B1 to Watson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Primary discussion focused around synthesizing a purchase request to be processed for post-transaction approval, as amended for inclusion in claim 17. Applicant will clarify claim language to better reflect the meaning and operations of synthesizing, which relates to automatically populating a purchasing form as if you haven't bought the item, but infact using the purchase transaction information to automatically populate the form. Applicant will clarify who is actually approving the form once complete, to remove ambiguities in the current claim language between a server and a purchasing management system performing the approval. Additionally, the steps or processes associated with the synthesis process will be further clarified in the claim language to state how the sysnthesis is carried out. Applicant will make amendments and examiner will review upon receipt..